PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM IN NLCI LIMITED NEYELI

Dr.S.THIRUMARAN

Associate Professor, P.G and Research Department of Commerce,
Alagappa Government Arts College, Karaikudi.

ABSTRACT

Performance appraisal is one element of the performance management process which involves different measurements throughout the organizations but it is the element which is important if organization is to take advantage of their most important asset employees and gain human capital advantage. There are other processes within the organizations such as technology and design but it is the human factor which is the most difficult to replicate and therefore the most valuable strategy implementation and delivery of the organizational strategic target is the best accomplished through high performance people and it is the development of these people which performance appraisal seek to advance. This is not the only identified purpose for performance appraisal. Ideal of the performance appraisal approach is that the desired outcome effectively enable the employee to meet their own performance targets to the organization meet their own performance targets through motivated self learning, also that they understand that this helps the organization meet and indeed exceed their strategic targets by linking individual performance targets to the overall strategic target of the organization.

Key Words: Performance appraisal, Organization, System and Acceptance

Introduction

Performance Appraisal is a method of evaluating the behavior of employees in the work spot, normally including both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of job performance. Performance here refers to the degree of accomplishment of the tasks that make up an individual's job. It indicates how well an individual is fulfilling the job demands. Often the term is confused with effort, but performance is always measured in terms of results and not efforts. In order to find out whether an employee is worthy of continued employment or not, and so whether he should receive a bonus a pay rise or promotion" his performance needs to be evaluated from time to time.

Objectives of the study

1. To study the theoretical background of performance appraisal.
2. To evaluate the effectiveness of performance appraisal system in NLCI Limited.

3. To offer suitable suggestions based on the findings of the study.

Methodology

Both primary and secondary data were used for the purpose of the study. Primary data were collected through interview schedule from the respondents. The secondary data were collected from various books, journals, etc.

Sample design

Total number of employees in Neyeli Lignite Corporation is categorized into executives, non-unionized supervisors and workmen. For determining the sample size for study, table for determining sample size developed by Glenn D.Israel was followed. As per the table for 3,000 populations, the sample size at 10 per cent precision at 90 per cent confidence level is 97. It is rounded the sample size is 100. Proportionate Stratified Random sampling method is adopted for the study. In the study area, there are 488 executives are working, out of that 19 executives are taken for study. 84 supervisors are working, out of that 3 supervisors are taken for the study, 1,374 IDL are working, out of that 53 IDl are taken for study. 639 labour are working the study area, out of those 25 labours are taken for the study. So, the total number of sample size is 100.

Demographic Profiles Wise Analysis of Performance Appraisal System

1. Gender and Level of Acceptance on Performance Appraisal System

Gender plays a vital role in information seeking behaviour, as their inherent needs and wants differ from each other. For that purpose the following null hypotheses was formulated and tested by using ANOVA test.

Ho: There is no significant difference is the level of acceptance on performance appraisal system based on gender.

Table 1

GENDER AND LEVEL OF ACCEPTANCE ON PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Variables	Classification	N	Mean	S.D.	F value	Sig.
Relationship with promotion	Male	73	4.07	1.206	3.682	.062*
	Female	27	4.11	1.251		
	Total	**100**	**4.08**	**1.212**		
Judgement to find out performers and non-performers	Male	73	3.42	1.224	4.289	.056*
	Female	27	3.15	1.322		
	Total	**100**	**3.35**	**1.250**		

Assigning higher job responsibility.	Male	73	3.82	1.085	.034	.853
	Female	27	3.78	.974		
	Total	**100**	**3.81**	**1.051**		
Charging scenario of role flexibility	Male	73	3.44	1.374	.673	.414
	Female	27	3.19	1.360		
	Total	**100**	**3.37**	**1.368**		
Motivational techniques.	Male	73	3.52	3.52	3.868	.052*
	Female	27	3.67	3.67		
	Total	**100**	**3.56**	**3.56**		
Formats designed properly	Male	73	3.25	3.25	.959	.330
	Female	27	3.56	3.56		
	Total	**100**	**3.33**	**3.33**		
Work smoothly and in time	Male	73	4.05	1.279	4.833	.030*
	Female	27	3.89	1.368		
	Total	**100**	**4.01**	**1.299**		
Discussion amongst appraiser and appraise.	Male	73	3.16	3.16	6.109	.015*
	Female	27	3.85	3.85		
	Total	**100**	**3.35**	**3.35**		
Employees performance report format	Male	73	3.44	1.333	.483	.489
	Female	27	3.22	1.502		
	Total	**100**	**3.38**	**1.376**		
Necessary parameters for judging a person's effectiveness	Male	73	**3.12**	1.452	3.379	.082*
	Female	27	**3.63**	1.471		
	Total	**100**	**3.26**	**1.468**		

Source: Computed from Primary Data   *Significant at 5 per cent level (p value ≤ 0.05)

It is found the above table 1 the level of acceptance of the respondent is not significant difference with Assigning higher job responsibility, Charging scenario of role flexibility, Formats designed properly, Employee performance report format. But the other variable Relationship with promotion, Judgement to find out performers and non-performers, Motivational techniques, Work smoothly and in time, Discussion amongst appraiser and appraise, Necessary parameters for judging a person's effectiveness significant difference is the level of Acceptance on performance appraisal system   based on gender.

Majority of the selected variables are significant difference with level of Acceptance on performance appraisal system and gender. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. It is conclude that gender of the respondent have difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system.

2. Age and Level of Acceptance on Performance Appraisal System

The level of acceptance on performance appraisal system of an individual also depends on the age of a person. The age of the employees plays an important role in the performance appraisal system. For that purpose the following null hypotheses was formulated and tested by using ANOVA test.

Ho: There is no significant difference is the level of acceptance on performance appraisal system   based on Age.

Table 2
AGE AND LEVEL OF ACCEPTANCE ON PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Variables	Classification	N	Mean	S.D.	F value	Sig.
Relationship with promotion	Below 30	19	4.26	1.195	2.718	.034*
	31-40	16	3.31	1.662		
	41-50	40	4.25	.954		
	Above 50	25	4.16	1.143		
	Total	**100**	**4.08**	**1.212**		
Judgement to find out performers and non-performers .	Below 30	19	3.37	1.383	2.023	.023*
	31-40	16	3.73	1.238		
	41-50	40	3.13	1.305		
	Above 50	25	3.44	1.044		
	Total	**100**	**3.55**	**1.250**		
Assigning higher job responsibility	Below 30	19	3.74	1.098	2.277	.045*
	31-40	16	3.25	1.125		
	41-50	40	3.90	1.008		
	Above 50	25	4.08	.191		
	Total	**100**	**3.81**	**1.051**		
Charging scenario of role flexibility	Below 30	19	3.26	1.240	.752	.524
	31-40	16	3.69	1.302		
	41-50	40	3.18	1.517		
	Above 50	25	3.56	1.261		
	Total	**100**	**3.37**	**1.368**		
Motivational techniques	Below 30	19	3.89	.994	2.629	.031*
	31-40	16	3.50	1.414		
	41-50	40	3.40	1.374		
	Above 50	25	3.60	1.354		
	Total	**100**	**3.56**	**1.305**		
Formats designed properly	Below 30	19	3.37	1.383	.216	.885
	31-40	16	3.13	1.455		
	41-50	40	3.30	1.488		
	Above 50	25	3.48	1.295		
	Total	**100**	**3.33**	**1.400**		
Work smoothly and in time	Below 30	19	4.00	1.291	2.633	.046*
	31-40	16	4.06	1.569		
	41-50	40	3.83	1.238		
	Above 50	25	4.28	1.242		
	Total	**100**	**4.01**	**1.299**		
Discussion amongst appraiser and appraise	Below 30	19	3.68	1.057	2.753	.012*
	31-40	16	3.56	1.263		
	41-50	40	2.98	1.310		
	Above 50	25	3.56	1.261		
	Total	**100**	**3.35**	**1.272**		

Employee performance report format	Below 30	19	3.32	1.635	2.076	.045*
	31-40	16	2.94	1.389		
	41-50	40	3.38	1.295		
	Above 50	25	3.72	1.275		
	Total	**100**	**3.38**	**1.376**		
Necessary parameters for judging a person's effectiveness	Below 30	19	3.53	1.349	.411	.745
	31-40	16	3.06	1.731		
	41-50	40	3.15	1.424		
	Above 50	25	3.36	1.497		
	Total	**100**	**3.26**	**1.468**		

Source: Computed from Primary Data   *Significant at 5 per cent level (p value ≤ 0.05)

It is found the above table 2 the level of acceptance of the respondent is not significant difference with Assigning Charging scenario of role flexibility, Formats designed properly. Other variables Relationship with promotion, Judgement to find out performers and non-performers, Assigning higher job responsibility, Motivational techniques, Work smoothly and in time, Discussion amongst appraiser and appraise, Employee performance report format and Necessary parameters for judging a person's effectiveness are significant difference is the level of acceptance on performance appraisal system   based on age of the respondents.

Majority of the selected variables are significant difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system and age. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. It is conclude that age of the respondent have difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system.

3. Marital Status and Level of Acceptance on Performance Appraisal System

The significant difference in influencing level of acceptance on performance appraisal system may depend upon their marital status, as their commitment and need are largely different from one another. For that purpose the following null hypotheses was formulated and tested by using ANOVA test.

Ho: There is no significant difference is the level of acceptance on performance appraisal system   based on marital status.

Table 3

MARITAL STATUS AND LEVEL OF ACCEPTANCE ON PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Variables	Classification	N	Mean	S.D	F value	Sig.
Relationship with promotion	Married	92	4.05	1.199	2.513	.048*
	Un married	8	4.38	1.408		
	Total	**100**	**4.08**	**1.212**		

Judgement to find out performers and non-performers	Married	92	3.35	1.235	.003	.953
	Un married	8	3.38	1.506		
	Total	**100**	**3.35**	**1.250**		
Assigning higher job responsibility	Married	92	3.78	1.050	.779	.380
	Un married	8	4.13	.991		
	Total	**100**	**3.81**	**1.051**		
Charging scenario of role flexibility	Married	92	3.36	1.363	.078	.781
	Un married	8	3.50	1.512		
	Total	**100**	**3.37**	**1.368**		
Motivational techniques	Married	92	3.53	1.330	2.804	.031*
	Un married	8	3.88	.991		
	Total	**100**	**3.56**	**1.305**		
Formats designed properly	Married	92	3.33	1.384	.009	.925
	Un married	8	3.38	1.685		
	Total	**100**	**3.33**	**1.400**		
Work smoothly and in time	Married	92	4.00	1.292	2.768	.041*
	Un married	8	4.13	1.458		
	Total	**100**	**4.01**	**1.299**		
Discussion amongst appraiser and appraise	Married	92	3.30	1.290	1.502	.223
	Un married	8	3.88	.835		
	Total	**100**	**3.35**	**1.266**		
Employee performance report format	Married	92	3.38	1.366	.000	.992
	Un married	8	3.38	1.598		
	Total	**100**	**3.38**	**1.376**		
Necessary parameters for judging a person's effectiveness.	Married	92	3.21	1.457	2.535	.048*
	Un married	8	3.88	1.553		
	Total	**100**	**3.26**	**1.468**		

Source: Computed from Primary Data   *Significant at 5 per cent level (p value ≤ 0.05)

It is found the above table 3 the level of acceptance of the respondent is not significant difference with Judgement to find out performers and non-performers, Assigning higher job responsibility and Charging scenario of role flexibility, Formats designed properly. But the other variables Relationship with promotion, Motivational techniques, Work smoothly and in time and Necessary parameters for judging a person's effectiveness are significant difference is the level of acceptance on performance appraisal system   based on marital status of the respondents.

Majority of the selected variables are not significant difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system and marital status. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. It is conclude that age of the respondent does not have difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system.

4. **Educational Qualification and Level of Acceptance on Performance Appraisal System**

Educational background of individuals may have influenced on the knowledge and enquiry mind and understanding capacity. Educational qualification may have direct or indirect effect on income earnings and savings. For that purpose the following null hypotheses was formulated and tested by using ANOVA test.

Ho: There is no significant difference is the level of acceptance on performance appraisal system   based on educational qualification.

Table 4

EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION AND LEVEL OF ACCEPTANCE ON PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Variables	Classification	N	Mean	S.D.	F value	Sig.
Relationship with promotion	Up to SSLC	15	3.87	1.246	2.845	.023*
	UP to HSC	3	5.00	.000		
	Degree level	49	4.02	1.250		
	Post Graduate	33	4.18	1.185		
	Total	**100**	**4.08**	**1.212**		
Judgement to find out performers and non-performers	Up to SSLC	15	3.67	1.291	2.822	.029*
	UP to HSC	3	3.67	1.155		
	Degree level	49	3.16	1.297		
	Post Graduate	33	3.45	1.175		
	Total	**100**	**3.35**	**1.250**		
Assigning higher job responsibility	Up to SSLC	15	4.07	.884	1.440	.236
	UP to HSC	3	3.00	1.732		
	Degree level	49	3.67	1.008		
	Post Graduate	33	3.97	1.104		
	Total	**100**	**3.81**	**1.051**		
Charging scenario of role flexibility	Up to SSLC	15	3.47	1.475	.639	.592
	UP to HSC	3	2.33	1.528		
	Degree level	49	3.35	1.393		
	Post Graduate	33	3.45	1.301		
	Total	**100**	3.37	1.368		
Motivational techniques	Up to SSLC	15	3.27	1.710	2.591	.047*
	UP to HSC	3	4.33	1.155		
	Degree level	49	3.31	1.140		
	Post Graduate	33	4.00	1.250		
	Total	**100**	**3.56**	**1.305**		
Formats designed properly	Up to SSLC	15	3.67	1.397	.565	.639
	UP to HSC	3	3.00	2.000		
	Degree level	49	3.18	1.380		
	Post Graduate	33	3.42	1.415		

	Total	**100**	**3.33**	**1.400**		
Work smoothly and in time	Up to SSLC	15	3.60	1.502	2.949	.037*
	UP to HSC	3	4.67	.577		
	Degree level	49	4.16	1.087		
	Post Graduate	33	3.91	1.508		
	Total	**100**	4.01	1.299		
Discussion amongst appraiser and appraise.	Up to SSLC	15	3.60	1.183	2.775	.045*
	UP to HSC	3	3.67	1.155		
	Degree level	49	3.43	1.225		
	Post Graduate	33	3.09	1.378		
	Total	**100**	**3.35**	**1.266**		
Employee performance report format	Up to SSLC	15	3.00	1.363	2.577	.047*
	UP to HSC	3	3.67	1.528		
	Degree level	49	3.37	1.365		
	Post Graduate	33	3.55	1.416		
	Total	**100**	**3.38**	**1.376**		
Necessary parameters for judging a person's effectiveness	Up to SSLC	15	3.20	1.521	1.339	.266
	UP to HSC	3	1.67	1.155		
	Degree level	49	3.27	1.483		
	Post Graduate	33	3.42	1.415		
	Total	**100**	3.26	1.468		

Source: Computed from Primary Data   *Significant at 5 per cent level (p value ≤ 0.05)

It is found the above table 4 the level of acceptance of the respondent is not significant difference with Assigning higher job responsibility, Charging scenario of role flexibility, Formats designed properly and Necessary parameters for judging a person's effectiveness. Other variables Relationship with promotion, Judgement to find out performers and non-performers, Motivational techniques, Work smoothly and in time, Discussion amongst appraiser and appraise and Employee performance report format are significant difference is the level of acceptance on performance appraisal system   based on educational qualification of the respondents.

Most of the variables are significant difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system and educational qualification. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. It is concluding that educational qualification of the respondent has difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system.

5. Designation and Level of Acceptance on Performance Appraisal System

The researcher has an interest to know the significant difference in level of acceptance on performance appraisal system influencing the designation of the respondents. For that purpose the following null hypotheses was formulated and tested by using ANOVA test.

Ho: There is no significant difference is the level of acceptance on performance appraisal system   based on designation.

Table 5

DESIGNATION AND LEVEL OF ACCEPTANCE ON PERFORMANCE

APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Variables	Classification	N	Mean	S.D.	F value	Sig.
Relationship with promotion	Executive	27	3.85	1.322	2.877	.043*
	Supervisors	24	4.00	1.504		
	Internet Lower	32	4.28	.813		
	Labour	17	4.18	1.237		
	Total	**100**	**4.08**	**1.212**		
Judgement to find out performers and non-performers .	Executive	27	3.22	1.219	2.582	.047*
	Supervisors	24	3.79	.977		
	Internet Lower	32	3.09	1.279		
	Labour	17	3.41	1.502		
	Total	**100**	**3.35**	**1.250**		
Assigning higher job responsibility	Executive	27	3.63	1.214	.552	.648
	Supervisors	24	3.92	1.100		
	Internet Lower	32	3.94	.878		
	Labour	17	3.71	1.047		
	Total	**100**	**3.81**	**1.051**		
Charging scenario of role flexibility	Executive	27	3.22	1.368	.257	.857
	Supervisors	24	3.42	1.412		
	Internet Lower	32	3.34	1.473		
	Labour	17	3.59	1.176		
	Total	**100**	3.37	1.368		
Motivational techniques	Executive	27	3.30	1.103	2.962	.041*
	Supervisors	24	3.67	1.373		
	Internet Lower	32	3.81	1.355		
	Labour	17	3.35	1.412		
	Total	**100**	**3.56**	**1.305**		
Formats designed properly	Executive	27	3.19	1.469	.230	.876
	Supervisors	24	3.38	1.377		
	Internet Lower	32	3.47	1.319		
	Labour	17	3.24	1.562		
	Total	**100**	**3.33**	**1.400**		
Work smoothly and in time	Executive	27	4.04	1.224	.757	.521
	Supervisors	24	4.17	1.494		
	Internet Lower	32	4.09	1.146		
	Labour	17	3.59	1.417		
	Total	**100**	4.01	1.299		
Discussion amongst appraiser and appraise.	Executive	27	2.89	1.502	2.714	.047*
	Supervisors	24	3.38	1.096		
	Internet Lower	32	3.50	1.295		
	Labour	17	3.76	.831		

	Total	**100**	**3.35**	**1.266**		
Employee performance report format	Executive	27	3.04	1.224		
	Supervisors	24	3.33	1.308		
	Internet Lower	32	3.78	1.581	2.663	.049*
	Labour	17	3.24	1.200		
	Total	**100**	**3.38**	**1.376**		
Necessary parameters for judging a person's effectiveness	Executive	27	3.19	1.302		
	Supervisors	24	2.67	1.659		
	Internet Lower	32	3.75	1.320	2.649	.043*
	Labour	17	3.29	1.490		
	Total	**100**	**3.26**	**1.468**		

Source: Computed from Primary Data   *Significant at 5 per cent level (p value ≤ 0.05)

It is found the above table 5 the level of acceptance of the respondent is not significant difference with Assigning higher job responsibility, Charging scenario of role flexibility, Formats designed properly, Work smoothly and in time. Other variables Relationship with promotion, Judgement to find out performers and non-performers, Motivational techniques, Discussion amongst appraiser and appraise, Employee performance report format, Necessary parameters for judging a person's effectiveness are significant difference is the level of acceptance on performance appraisal system   based on designation of the respondents.

Most of the variables are significant difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system and designation. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. It is concluding that designation of the respondent has difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system.

6. Monthly Income and Level of Acceptance on Performance Appraisal System

Earning capacity of the individuals is based on monthly income of the respondents. Monthly income is one of the important factors which may be influenced investment, saving and standard of living. For that purpose the following null hypotheses was formulated and tested by using ANOVA test.

Ho: There is no significant difference is the level of acceptance on performance appraisal system   based on monthly income.

Table 5.15

MONTHLY INCOME AND LEVEL OF ACCEPTANCE ON PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Variables	**Classification**	**N**	**Mean**	**S.D.**	**F value**	**Sig.**
Relationship with promotion	Below-20,000	5	4.60	.548		

	20,001-30,000	10	4.00	1.491		
	30,001-40,000	21	4.38	1.117	2.987	.040*
	Above 40,000	64	3.95	1.227		
	Total	**100**	**4.08**	**1.212**		
Judgement to find out performers and non-performers	Below- 20,000	5	3.00	1.414		
	20,001-30,000	10	3.60	1.265		
	30,001-40,000	21	3.67	1.426	.892	.448
	Above 40,000	64	3.23	1.178		
	Total	**100**	**3.35**	**1.250**		
Assigning higher job responsibility	Below-20,000	5	4.20	.837		
	20,001-30,000	10	3.80	1.135		
	30,001-40,000	21	3.57	.926	3.630	.011*
	Above 40,000	64	3.86	1..096		
	Total	**100**	**3.81**	**1.051**		
Charging scenario of role flexibility	Below-20,000	5	3.00	1.414		
	20,001-30,000	10	3.30	1.418		
	30,001-40,000	21	3.24	1.338	.268	.848
	Above 40,000	64	3.45	1.391		
	Total	**100**	**3.37**	**1.368**		
Motivational techniques	Below-20,000	5	3.60	.894	3.227	.023*
	20,001-30,000	10	3.80	1.317		
	30,001-40,000	21	3.67	1.426		
	Above 40,000	64	3.48	1.309		
	Total	**100**	**3.56**	**1.305**		
Formats designed properly	Below-20,000	5	3.80	1.304		
	20,001-30,000	10	2.90	1.449		
	30,001-40,000	21	3.33	1.560	.504	681
	Above 40,000	64	3.36	1.361		
	Total	**100**	**3.33**	**1.400**		
Work smoothly and in time	Below-20,000	5	4.00	1.732		
	20,001-30,000	10	4.30	1.059		
	30,001-40,000	21	3.95	1.359	.184	.907
	Above 40,000	64	3.98	1.303		
	Total	**100**	4.01	1.299		
Discussion amongst appraiser and appraise	Below-20,000	5	3.60	1.140		
	20,001-30,000	10	4.10	.568		
	30,001-40,000	21	3.81	1.123	3.503	.018*
	Above 40,000	64	3.06	1.320		
	Total	**100**	**3.35**	**1.266**		
Employee performance report format	Below-20,000	5	3.60	1.949		
	20,001-30,000	10	3.40	1.430		
	30,001-40,000	21	3.57	1.399	3.245	.029*
	Above 40,000	64	3.30	1.341		
	Total	**100**	**3.38**	**1.376**		
Necessary parameters for judging a person's effectiveness.	Below-20,000	5	4.00	1.414		
	20,001-30,000	10	3.40	1.506		
	30,001-40,000	21	3.76	1.446	2.916	.038*
	Above 40,000	64	3.02	1.442		

| | Total | 100 | 3.26 | 1.468 | | |

Source: Computed from Primary Data   *Significant at 5 per cent level (p value ≤ 0.05)

It is found the above table 6 the level of acceptance of the respondent is not significant difference with Judgement to find out performers and non-performers, Charging scenario of role flexibility, Formats designed properly and Work smoothly and in time. Other variables Relationship with promotion, Assigning higher job responsibility, Motivational techniques, Discussion amongst appraiser and appraise, Employee performance report format and Necessary parameters for judging a person's effectiveness are significant difference is the level of acceptance on performance appraisal system   based on monthly income of the respondents.

Majority of the variables are significant difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system and monthly income. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. It is concluding that monthly income of the respondent has difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system.

7. Year of Experience and Level of Acceptance on Performance Appraisal System

Experience is one of the most important factors in influencing levels. In NLCIL employees have different levels of experience. For that purpose the following null hypotheses was formulated and tested by using ANOVA test.

Ho: There is no significant difference is the level of acceptance on performance appraisal system   based on year of experience.

Table 7

YEAR OF EXPERIENCE AND LEVEL OF ACCEPTANCE ON PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Variables	Classification	N	Mean	S.D.	F value	Sig
Relationship with promotion	Fresher	15	4.00	1.000	1.515	.213
	1 - 3 years	3	4.13	1.025		
	4 - 5 years	49	4.60	.995		
	Above 5 years	33	3.90	1.300		
	Total	**100**	**4.08**	**1.212**		
Judgement to find out performers and non-performers	Fresher	15	2.67	1.528	3.419	.020*
	1 - 3 years	3	3.50	1.317		
	4 - 5 years	49	4.05	.945		
	Above 5 years	33	3.11	1.240		
	Total	**100**	**3.35**	**1.250**		
Assigning higher job responsibility	Fresher	15	3.67	1.155		
	1 - 3 years	3	3.63	.885		

	4 - 5 years	49	3.70	1.174	3.104	.019*
	Above 5 years	33	3.90	1.060		
	Total	**100**	**3.81**	**1.051**		
Charging scenario of role flexibility	Fresher	15	1.67	1.155	2.634	.047*
	1 - 3 years	3	3.44	1.031		
	4 - 5 years	49	3.45	1.538		
	Above 5 years	33	3.41	1.371		
	Total	**100**	3.37	1.368		
Motivational techniques	Fresher	15	2.67	.577	2.773	.044*
	1 - 3 years	3	3.81	1.167		
	4 - 5 years	49	3.75	1.446		
	Above 5 years	33	3.48	1.312		
	Total	**100**	**3.56**	**1.305**		
Formats designed properly	Fresher	15	2.33	1.155	.516	.673
	1 - 3 years	3	3.38	1.310		
	4 - 5 years	49	3.35	1.565		
	Above 5 years	33	3.36	1.391		
	Total	**100**	**3.33**	**1.400**		
Work smoothly and in time	Fresher	15	4.67	.577	1.615	.
	1 - 3 years	3	3.94	1.569		.191
	4 - 5 years	49	4.50	.889		
	Above 5 years	33	3.84	1.331		
	Total	**100**	**4.01**	1.299		
Discussion amongst appraiser and appraise	Fresher	15	4.00	1.000	3.694	.014*
	1 - 3 years	3	3.69	1.014		
	4 - 5 years	49	3.95	1.050		
	Above 5 years	33	3.03	1.316		
	Total	**100**	**3.35**	**1.266**		
Employee performance report format	Fresher	15	4.00	1.732	2.087	.107
	1 - 3 years	3	3.19	1.834		
	4 - 5 years	49	4.00	1.076		
	Above 5 years	33	3.20	1.276		
	Total	**100**	**3.38**	**1.376**		
Necessary parameters for judging a person's effectiveness	Fresher	15	4.33	.577	2.923	.038*
	1 - 3 years	3	3.81	1.223		
	4 - 5 years	49	3.65	1.565		
	Above 5 years	33	2.93	1.448		
	Total	**100**	**3.26**	**1.468**		

Source: Computed from Primary Data   *Significant at 5 per cent level (p value ≤ 0.05)

It is found the above table 7 the level of acceptance of the respondent is not significant difference Relationship with promotion, Formats designed properly, Work smoothly and in time and Employee performance report format. But other variables Judgement to find out performers and non-performers, Assigning higher job responsibility, Charging scenario of role flexibility, Motivational techniques, Discussion amongst appraiser and appraise and Necessary parameters for judging a person's effectiveness are significant

difference is the level of acceptance on performance appraisal system based on year of experience of the respondents.

Majority of the variables are significant difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system and year of experience. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. It is concluding that year of experience of the respondent has difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system.

Conclusion

This research paper have identifies the level of acceptance on performance appraisal system. The opinions on performance appraisal are described. Hence it was concluded that out of seven demographic profile gender, age, educational qualification, designation, monthly income and year experience are significant difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system. The marital status does not have difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system. Majority of the demographic profile are significant difference with level of acceptance on performance appraisal system.

References

1. Amrir (2013) The Effect of Training on Employee Performance. Journal of Business and Management.Vol.5,No.4 pp-137-147.
2. Chepkoech, E. (2011). Effect of Teachers' Performance Appraisal on their Productivity. A case of public secondary schools in Trans-Nzoia West District, Kenya.
3. Israel, Glenn D. 1992. Sampling the evidence of extension program impact. Program evaluation and organizational development, IFAS, University of Florida. PEOD-5. October.
4. Mamoria, C.B (1995), Personnel Management, Himalaya Publishing House New Delhi.
5. Annual Report, NLC India Limited, Neyveli, 2018-2019
6. Annual Report, Ministry of Employees 1994-95
7. www.nlcindia. com
8. www.researchgate.net/publications